The Oregonian.

Entered at the Postoffice at Portland, Oregon, as second-class matter.

TELEPHONES.

Editorial Rooms....166 | Business Office....667

REVISED SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

By Mail (postage prepaid), in Advance—

Daily, with Sunday, per month	$ 85
Daily, Sunday excepted, per year	7 50
Daily, with Sunday, per year	9 00
Sunday, per year	2 00
The Weekly, per year	1 50
The Weekly, 3 months	50
To City Subscribers—	
Daily, per week, delivered, Sundays excepted	15c
Daily, per week, delivered, Sundays included	20c

POSTAGE RATES.

United States, Canada and Mexico:

10 to 16-page paper	1c
18 to 32-page paper	2c

Foreign rates double.

News or discussion intended for publication in The Oregonian should be addressed invariably "Editor The Oregonian," not to the name of any individual. Letters relating to advertising, subscriptions or to any business matter should be addressed simply "The Oregonian."

The Oregonian does not buy poems or stories from individuals, and cannot undertake to return any manuscripts sent to it without solicitation. No stamps should be inclosed for this purpose.

Puget Sound Bureau—Captain A. Thompson, office at 1111 Pacific avenue, Tacoma. Box 908, Tacoma Postoffice.

Eastern Business Office—The Tribune building, New York City; "The Rookery," Chicago; the S. C. Beckwith special agency, New York.

For sale in San Francisco by J. K. Cooper, 746 Market street, near the Palace Hotel; Goldsmith Bros., 236 Sutter street; F. W. Pitts, 1008 Market street; Foster & Orear, Ferry News stand.

For sale in Los Angeles by B. F. Gardner, 250 So. Spring street, and Oliver & Haines, 106 So. Spring street.

For sale in Chicago by the P. O. News Co., 217 Dearborn street.

For sale in Omaha by H. C. Shears, 105 N. Sixteenth street, and Barkalow Bros., 1612 Farnam street.

For sale in Salt Lake by the Salt Lake News Co., 77 W. Second South street.

For sale in New Orleans by Ernest A. Co., 115 Royal street.

On file in Washington, D. C., with A. W. Dunn, 500 14th N. W.

For sale in Denver, Colo., by Hamilton & Kendrick, 906-912 Seventh street.

TODAY'S WEATHER.—Increasing cloudiness, followed by rain; warmer; southerly winds.

PORTLAND, TUESDAY, JANUARY 1.

Please note with pain and grief that that redoubtable champion of the "rights reserved" and "powers not delegated" and the ancient landmark, Hon. Grover Cleveland, is assailing the Constitution in some of its most ponderous and respectable parts. We are all familiar with the Electoral College, which the fathers, in their inscrutable but inspired wisdom provided, and we know from the anti-imperialists themselves how abandonedly infamous is the slightest breath of disrespect toward the meanest punctuation mark in the noble instrument that contains it. Yet Mr. Cleveland has the effrontery to pronounce the Electoral College "indirect and cumbersome." We tolerate along with it, he says, a "baffling confusion of ideas," and "flagrant opposition to the declared popular will." He makes bold also to denounce the length of the Presidential term, which he would lengthen from four to six years. These animadversions upon the inspired wisdom of the framers of the Constitution should receive, as they doubtless will, the contempt and derision of every true anti-imperialist, who is sleeplessly on the alert for defamers of the Constitution. In this case there is special cause for alarm in the fact that in proposing election of Presidents by popular vote Mr. Cleveland is but paving the way for the overthrow of state rights and the consequent triumph of a strong Federal Government, and then an empire. This scarcely concealed purpose will be sure to arouse the Cleveland Democrats, who are the special enemies of centralization and empire. It is well that the secret enemies of the Constitution should thus show their hand. Forewarned is forearmed. What more fitting that in these closing hours of the nineteenth century, when men everywhere are sad and solemn to a degree, this plot against our liberties should be disclosed? Antis, all, to the front. Down with Cleveland and up with the Constitution!

Sugar and tobacco men of Cuba are out in a demand for reduction of duties on their products so they can do more business with the United States. Governor Wood is reported as in favor of their representations, but it might be well to let this matter rest a while, in view of the uncertainty about Cuba's future political status. It takes but a very limited amount of political discernment to see that Cuba, as a part of the United States, will sustain a very different relation to us from that she will occupy as an independent government. If Cuba is annexed, she can expect an arrangement like Porto Rico's, or something better; but if she is to have independence, she can look for nothing else but to be treated as a foreign country. Her thrifty planters will want the best terms available, no doubt, but we have sugar and tobacco of our own. It is hardly the logical thing for us to establish easy tariffs now, which might form an awkward precedent after independence has been granted. We trust our Cuban friends do not presume upon the fertility of their sugar fields, or the excellent quality of their tobacco, to anticipate the blessings of independence conjunctively with the advantages of annexation. There are a few things worth while in membership of the American Empire; but they will not be promiscuously distributed among the republics of Central America, insular or isthmian. We shall do a good deal for Cuba, but she must do something for herself. If she wants to be independent, let her pay duties. If she wants the fellowship and freedom of American sovereignty, there are responsibilities as well as liberties. The tail goes with the hide.

Legislation of 1900 presents a tendency, nearly uniform, toward further entrance by the state into the affairs of individuals. Several states are extending Government inspection and care of orchards. Missouri has enacted a law against department stores, Massachusetts legislates for workingmen's trains, South Carolina has embarked in state insurance, Rhode Island and Maryland are building bicycle and footpaths, New Jersey and New York are building parks, Virginia is taxing notaries on their seals, Iowa and Ohio have tax inquisitors to pry on personal holdings. Fifteen states are now spending money for traveling public libraries, and twenty-nine have some sort of anti-trust laws. Nearly all these undertakings are contrary to the spirit of the old Democratic conception of limiting use of taxes to the strictly necessary functions of government. It is obvious that the sentiment of the time on the proper province of the state is in a transition period. The old idea that Government must do nothing that private enterprise can do seems to be giving way to a spirit of practical inquiry after the things that can be done publicly more expeditiously than privately. In one aspect, the change is desirable, and in another it is ominous. We shall get good things done, doubtless, that private initiative is too thrifty to undertake. But, on the other hand, the increasing tendency to withdraw from the workers, through taxation, support for the drones, both reveals and promotes a socialistic atmosphere as discouraging to thrift as it is solacing to the shiftless. An incidental benefit ought to be gradual removal of restrictions on individual enterprise. If the energetic have to carry everybody else, Government must make it as easy as possible for them to do business. A man can pay a good many taxes if he is allowed free scope to buy and sell.

Treatment of the dependencies, as presented to popular understanding, labors under the same disadvantage possessed by the money question. The legal question whether the Constitution follows the flag is as precarious of solution by popular vote as is the economic problem of a coinage ratio. The heart of the people is in the right place, but its head may, in a particular case, be inadequately furnished. In the last two elections more people than we like to think voted for prosperity on the one hand and against the Money Power on the other. And so as regards the dependencies, the popular instinct for just and even generous treatment of the islands is altogether distinct from the constitutional question as to the powers and limitations of Congress, though men as conscientious and thoughtful as Harrison and Cleveland have stooped to mix them together. We ought to deal justly by the dependencies, certainly, and no one can cavil at appeals to that irreproachable sentiment; but whether the Supreme Court or Congress is the legal source of that justice is not to be settled by appeal to any sentiment, however lofty. Yet it is far from clear that this distinction can be made in popular discussion. When questions of constitutional interpretation or economic policy become National issues, they are pretty certain to be fought out at the polls, and the verdict of the election will usually stand. This shows us the importance of preparedness for popular government. Not every people can succeed at it. In the United States we have rarely made mistakes. In Latin America they make little else. In the Philippines the electorate will not have unlimited power till it is fit for it.

This West Point examination closes with a most satisfactory record of thorough investigation. Facts enough have been brought to light to show that, despite all the improvements introduced by the energy and persistence of Colonel Mills, and in spite of the harmless nature of most of the pranks played and discipline enforced by higher upon lower classmen, a great deal of dangerous and ruffianly brutality still exists. It seems a pity, on the whole, that so inherently weak a case as that of Booz should have been the subject of the inquiry, for the assertion that he died from injuries received two years before his death seems, from the evidence, insupportable. The fact remains, however, that a great deal has been going on at West Point of which Colonel Mills was ignorant; and the inference is that he needs, for one thing, more thorough methods of espionage. It is to be hoped that the testimony itself, and the discussion that is sure to follow in Congress, will go far toward eliminating what sympathy with hazing still survives in the Army and in the higher West Point circles. One of the most exasperating developments of the inquiry has been the fact that, whenever Colonel Mills inflicted punishment for brutality, the offenders were able to bring strong political influence to bear in their favor. Doubtless some of the very statesmen whose voices will soon resound in Congress against the academy management have labored diligently for reinstatement of some of the scapegraces Colonel Mills has punished for brutality. That is to say, we are a great country, and our humbug statesmanship is on a colossal scale.

TWENTIETH CENTURY OREGON.

One hundred years ago what we know as Oregon was part of the vast wilderness west of the Mississippi River beyond the bounds of the United States as defined by the treaty of 1783. Captain Gray's discovery of the Columbia River in 1792 had directed attention this way, but many years elapsed before even the most optimistic dared to dream of American settlement in this region. The Louisiana cession in 1803 paved the way for the Lewis and Clark expedition, and it in turn for the settlement of Astoria, and the unsuccessful ventures of American traders and trappers. After complications which all but resulted in war with Great Britain, title to Oregon was settled in the United States and American sovereignty began.

Allowing for the influence of Gray's discovery in the final adjustment of affairs, Oregon's first hundred years of existence may be said to have ended with the nineteenth century. But little was done in the remaining years of the eighteenth century and nothing in the opening decade of the nineteenth that did not immediately provoke the antagonism of Great Britain. Astoria fell into the hands of the British in the War of 1812, and from then until the boundary settlement, in 1846, there were constant conflicts between the subjects of the two nations, joint occupancy and threatened war. The Southern States opposed territorial government for Oregon in 1848 because they knew slavery would not be benefited, but they readily granted state government in 1859, because they hoped that the new state would be favorable to slavery.

Oregon's progress was slow until the coming of the transcontinental railroad, in 1883. There has been more development in all lines in the seventeen years that have since intervened than there was in the thirty-five years between the organization of territorial government and 1883. Population increased 161,000 between 1850 and 1880, and 239,000 between 1880 and 1900. Manufactures, though still in need of a cheap fuel and larger markets, have increased many fold. Agriculture and its associate pursuits, horticulture and dairying, supply the home demand for all products and leaves a surplus for export. The permanence and great value of placer and quartz gold mines are no longer doubted, and extensive production has begun. All industries are on a permanent basis.

The last year of the nineteenth century goes on record as Oregon's greatest year. Products of farms, range, factories, fisheries, forests, added to the foreign commerce, credit the state with $126,745,691 70. Of this amount, farm, orchard and range contributed over $49,500,000. The manufacturing output will not be definitely known until the census reports are published, but it is believed that it will be close to $60,000,000. Mines, fisheries and foreign commerce complete the total.

The new century is full of promise for Oregon. Every industry is thriving and the people are prosperous and contented. The older sections of the state are making steady growth, while the newer ones report phenomenal progress. Perhaps the brightest outlook is for isolated areas in Central Oregon and on the Coast. Their resources are too many and varied not to attract capital for development and railroad building. When they are opened up, there will be a greater Oregon.

THE OUTLOOK FOR THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

What is the present outlook for the twentieth century? This question is variously answered, but the answer of the most eminent prophets, whether orthodox or heterodox, Christian or agnostic, is pessimistic rather than optimistic, whether the critic speaks from the standpoint of Europe or America. Bishop Potter, in America, looks forward to an increased sway of materialism, the greed of wealth, whose baleful increasing influence he sees in the college, the church, in the market-place, in the shop, in society, high and low. Rev. Dr. John Watson (Ian Maclaren) fears that while the people are now the rulers, have better wages, more decent hours and ample means of education, they have no strong spiritual life, do not know how to use their votes, have not learned to be frugal and temperate, read great books without thinking about the great questions. In short, Dr. Watson believes that the people have grown careless and frivolous with freedom and prosperity, and that their gods are pleasure and comfort. He finds a dreary falling off in English literature, not only from the age that included Scott, Byron, Wordsworth, Shelley, Lamb, Keats, Hazlitt, Coleridge, but from the Victorian age, that includes Thackeray, George Eliot, Charlotte Bronte, Dickens, Swinburne, Tennyson, Clough, Browning, Macaulay, Green, Lecky, Carlyle, Arnold, Froude, Freeman and Ruskin. He finds no name in English statesmanship that stirs the blood like Disraeli, Bright, Cobden or Gladstone. He finds the blight of commonplace settling down on the church. He finds but very few men of genius and eloquence in the pulpit. He finds intelligence, education, clever, cheap work in literature and the pulpit, but it is the excellence of uniformity, the average man coming into his kingdom.

Frederic Harrison, the great English positivist, is far more pessimistic than Dr. Watson, for he not only sees all that depresses Dr. Watson, but he is without Dr. Watson's belief that in the twentieth century, "while there may be a certain commonplaceness of action and talent, a larger number of people will have part in the affairs of state and bigger share of the riches of life; the workman will be better off, fewer men will be able to live without working, and more men will get reward for their work." Mr. Harrison does not believe that "life is growing nobler or purer; that we are coming nearer to the just, the loving, the beautiful, the true." He is doubtful whether the nineteenth century is a glorious advance upon the eighteenth, or indeed upon the seventeenth. While he believes in the gradual improvement of civilization by wide areas and epochs, he is convinced that "our immediate generation has been sinking of late to meaner ideals, to coarser ways of life, to more vulgar types of literature, to more open craving after wealth and a more insolent assertion of pride and force." He thinks the "blood and iron" policy of Bismarck of force and ambition, of might without right, and to the victors the spoils, has been adopted by Europe and America, and for this reason that the outlook for the twentieth century is exceptionally gloomy. Mammon marching behind Moloch is Frederic Harrison's forecast for the new century. Mr. Harrison holds that Christianity is not more truly a civilizing, moralizing force, vital religion is not more general and more effective in preventing us as a people from injustice and oppression, and as men and women from the pride of life and the lusts of the flesh, than it was sixty years ago. He sees in the last generation of our century a fearful decline in literature, in poetry, romance, philosophy, science and religion.

It is easy to point out that these pessimists are speaking in the querulous voices of men who are long past their youth, and who are either clerical or lay preachers by profession, but the facts are with them so far as concerns their conclusion that the decade which closes this century does not equal in power either of the middle decades of the century (1840-1860) in poetry, in science, in philosophy. Nevertheless, granting this to be a fact, it furnishes no assurance that their gloomy forecast for the twentieth century will be fulfilled. In the matter of the great events of human history, the unexpected has generally happened. At the dawn of the fifteenth century the wildest dreamer would not have forecast that it would include the invention of printing and the discovery of America. At the opening day of the sixteenth century, who anticipated that it would include "the Reformation" that would divide Christendom into two great hostile religious and theological camps, or that the top of English poetic genius would be suddenly reached in the supreme and universal excellence of Shakespeare? At the dawn of the seventeenth century who suspected that its first fifty years would see the throne of England upset and its King die under the ax of the executioner as a traitor to the people? At the dawn of the eighteenth century who believed that France then of Louis XIV would before the century closed cut off the head of its King only to be swallowed up in a bloody swamp of nihilism, out of which she was glad to be rescued by "the man on horseback," the military despot, Bonaparte? Who anticipated the successful revolt of the American colonies of England? At the outset of the nineteenth century who suspected that the victorious military despot, Emperor Napoleon, of 1804, would die a wretched military prisoner, chained to a rock in the Atlantic Ocean? Who would have predicted the defeat of Austria by Prussia; the crushing of France and the creation of Imperial Germany; the Civil War in America, with its extinction of slavery; the unity of Italy, or even the possession of the Philippines by the United States? Who prefigured at the opening day of the nineteenth century that its first fifty years would be the most splendidly productive age in great literature in the annals of England since the age of Shakespeare?

It is safe to say of the twentieth century that it will not equal the nineteenth century in the literature of the imagination; noble poetry, or splendid fiction. It will be an intensely utilitarian, but not a sordidly materialistic, age. The application of the forces of steam and electricity to human progress will be continued until they girdle the whole earth. Every unexplored country will be mapped and its physical geography written. The literature will be history, science, political economy. The world will care for facts; will value men who can do things admirably rather than those people who never say any foolish things and never do anything worth doing. Education will be specific and technical, rather than purely academical, because the pressure of the age will not permit young men to lose time in academical education when they need specific knowledge and training for bread-winning. It will be a busy age. Its philanthropy will be pursued by business methods. It will not dream; it will think chiefly to the end of practical results; it will not dream about the unknown and the unknowable unless the dream promises to declare a dividend. The twentieth century will be a century of utilitarianism, an age when war will be avoided except when it is necessary to remove obstacles to the great victories of peace; an age without revolutions, outside of France and Spain; an age that will have Great Britain, Germany, Russia and the United States for its great actors and dictators of events and illustrators of that human progress that Victor Hugo called the "stride of God."

The distinguished foreign dead for the past year include James Martineau, the ablest preacher and thinker in the history of the English Unitarian Church; John Ruskin, Max Muller, the Duke of Argyll, St. George Mivart, a distinguished Roman Catholic theologian and scientist; Sir Donald Stewart, famous English soldier; Oscar Wilde, Prince de Joinville and General Joubert. The notable dead of America are: Ex-Secretary of the Navy Richard W. Thompson, General John M. Palmer, General John A. McClernand, General John G. Parke, Colonel E. H. Liscum, distinguished veterans of the Civil War; Rev. Dr. R. S. Storrs, Rev. Dr. Cyrus A. Bartol, Bishop Wilmer, John Sherman, United States Senator Davis, of Minnesota; ex-Mayor Strong, of New York City; C. H. Hoyt, playwright; Oswald Ottendorffer, eminent journalist; ex-Governor Wolcott, of Massachusetts.

The confession of the Christian Scientists in New York City that they use milk medicinally; that they pull teeth and fill them, and blister boils, gives their whole case away. Christian Science removes the bad tooth, but denies the existence of the typhoid germ, although the germ is just as real as the bad tooth. If it is proper to ignore the choking of diphtheria, then the illness that calls for the nourishment by the administration of milk ought to be equally ignored. This peculiar school of quackery seems to be bottomed on Mother Eddy's book, whose record of miraculous cures is such a tissue of fable as to recall Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes' famous lines:

"Pamphlets, which to facts appeal,
Each fact as slippery as a fresh caught eel."

Vice-President-elect Roosevelt will spend the greater portion of the first month of the new century in the Rocky Mountains in quest of big game. He and his party will hunt in Coyote Basin, which has been closed to men with guns for a year and is expected to furnish plenty of fierce game. When he was plain Theodore Roosevelt, unknown to politics and politicians, the soon-to-be Vice-President of the United States roamed the Bad Lands in search of health and game, and found both. His experiences were embodied in a book that delighted boys and made Nimrods envious the country over. It is said that he looks forward with a boy's eagerness to a renewal of his experience in the mountains, robust sport being quite to his liking.

Do they have wants in heavenly harmony who demand an open door in China and exclusion of Chinese from the United States? Whose mental equilibrium requires freedom for our missionaries in China and intolerance of Confucianism in America? Who wish to preserve all our trade privileges with the Mikado, but are unwilling to grant his subjects reciprocal favors? Whose daily bread comes from the sale of commodities beyond the sea, but whose notions come from selfishness, unreason and perverse conception of mutual service? Do such persons need an apocalypse of equity to reveal to them their religion of inconsistent selfishness?

A bill will be introduced early in the present session of the Idaho Legislature making the kidnaping of children punishable by death. There are many wealthy mining men whose homes are in Boise, to whom the Cudahy case appeals as a menace to their children, who, it is said, are behind the demand for such a law. A majority of the members of the Legislature have been seen or communicated with on the subject, and all favor the proposal.

The effort to institute a Young Women's Christian Association in this city is being carried on systematically, and with excellent promise of success. Its purpose is certainly one that appeals to the practical humanitarian, as well as to the student of sociology, and deserves substantial encouragement.

Let us give credit where credit is due, but let us also give credit to the Washington and Idaho delegations at Washington for the Snake and Columbia River appropriations. If these rivers flowed through Oregon, we might have less to pat ourselves on the back about.

The people who have most to say about Castellane and Manchester are poor devils who write newspaper paragraphs for $10 a week.

Since no newspaper man has been President, Bryan's launch into the business is a more favorable sign than otherwise.

Bryan seems to be the only man in doubt about whether he will run for President again.

CAN'T ESCAPE COMPETITION.

Trust Magnate's Lot Is Not Always a Happy One.

St. Paul Pioneer Press.

That the acquisitiveness of man, even unaided by legislation, is likely to prove sufficient to prevent the complete or permanent monopolization of ordinary industries has frequently been pointed out in these columns. Not until those who are bent upon the monopoly of any industry secure the monopoly of all capital and of all expert service can they exact from their customers excessive prices for more than brief periods. And the realization of this precedent condition is, in the nature of things, unthinkable. As long as there is capital unemployed or earning only a moderate profit, as long as there are men of enterprise and brains, every attempt at monopoly will be subject to competition more or less effective and more or less permanent. For as long as men of enterprise and capital see the chance of large profits in any undertaking they will enter upon that undertaking sooner or later. Consequently, the trust, in most cases, is bound to limit the prices it makes to the level that will keep competitors out of the field, seeking to earn its profits rather by large sales on small margins than by high prices. If it does not, it has to pay the costly penalty of competition or of buying out competitors. In the long run the only exceptions to this rule are those concerns which enjoy some special favors, either in railroad rates, in monopoly of the sources of raw material, in patent rights, or in something of the kind that prevents free competition. The number of these is comparatively small, and would be still further reduced by wise regulation.

That those who are not protected by special advantages are bound to pay the penalty of excessive earnings is shown in the recent experiences of several of the more conspicuous trusts. In addition to its continuous fight with the Arbuckle and other refineries, some of which it has been compelled to buy at considerable expense, the sugar trust is now face to face with a new project. One of the large Philadelphia refineries whose plant was sold to the trust is preparing to build a big independent plant and re-enter the field. In the sheet steel industries competitors of the trust are almost daily coming forward to be bought up on their own terms or to permanently compete. The rubber trust has found that its nicely arranged and guaranteed prices are persistently disregarded by independent companies which undersell it. Even the glucose trust, according to reports, and the tin-plate trust will soon have to face rivals, one with $3,000,000 capital and the Standard Oil Company back of it, and the other with $5,000,000 capital and patented processes. This state of things, together with the disaster and vicissitudes that have visited the attempts at monopoly in so many lines of industry, ought and probably will put a damper on the formation of combinations with monopoly in view. Against combinations formed, as a few of them have been, solely to effect economies in production not attainable in small plants, there is no rational economic reason to protest. For such combinations, whatever incidental discomfort they may cause to individuals are, by making possible lower prices, a distinct benefit to the thousands or hundreds of thousands of consumers for whom they produce. It is such combinations as these that are likely to be the rule when the promoter and his rainbow prospectus have been thoroughly discredited by experience as they have been in other schemes for reaping fabulous profits ever since joint stock companies became popular. What is needed in trust legislation is not so much indiscriminate suppression as wise regulation that will do away with extortion, dishonesty and favoritism and foster the concerns whose primary aim is economy in production.

THE SUBSIDY LOBBY.

Things That Seem to Have Escaped Mr. Hanna's Attention.

New York Evening Post.

A telegram from Cleveland to the Associated Press says that Senator Hanna has not heard of any lobby at Washington in favor of the ship subsidy bill, and that the only lobby he knows anything about is that of the foreign steamship companies, trying to defeat the measure. If this is an authentic interview with Mr. Hanna, it shows that he does not know the true meaning of the word lobby. It is defined in the Century Dictionary in these words:

"Persons who occupy, or resort to, the lobby, or the approaches to a legislative chamber, for the purpose of transacting business with the members, and especially of influencing their official action or votes."

Mr. Hanna has not heard of any such persons in Washington seeking to influence the official action or votes of Congress in favor of the ship subsidy bill. He has not heard, for example, of Clement A. Griscom, Alexander R. Smith, or ex-Senator Edmunds, as being in Washington trying to promote the passage of that bill. The only lobby he knows anything about is one composed of foreign steamship companies trying to defeat it.

We imagine that Senator Hanna is the only person who has been much in Washington during the past two years who has not seen the three persons above named, and many others, using their best efforts in the approaches to the halls of Congress to promote the passage of the bill. To be a member of the lobby, it is not necessary that the person should be paid for his services, but it is commonly reported and believed that two of three we have named have been handsomely paid for their services, and it is well known that the first one in the list, being the president of the International Navigation Company, is the principal beneficiary of the bill. If a pecuniary interest or motive is necessary to give the character of odium to a lobby, we have it here in abundance. We do not affirm, however, that odium attaches to such services as Mr. Edmunds has rendered to the subsidy grabbers. We merely point out that he comes within the accepted definition of the term.

Dreyfus Case a Closed Incident.

New York Evening Post.

No attempt to reopen the Dreyfus case can be successful, in the present temper of the French Government and people, unless a "new fact" is discovered as the basis of a fresh appeal to the Court of Cassation. Zola warns his countrymen that the new fact may yet appear, humiliatingly for them, in a revelation by the Emperor William of the name of the real culprit. But the Waldeck Rousseau Ministry regards the evil of the day as sufficient, and has pressed through the chambers a bill of amnesty for all concerned. A semi-official statement declares, what is undoubtedly true, that the Rennes court-martial observed all the forms of law, and that its verdict must be accepted on peril of undermining respect for all tribunals. Thus the matter stands, and the bold efforts of Professor Stapfer and other intellectuals, in whose minds the injustice done under the forms of law still rankles, are doomed to failure unless the Court of Appeal can be shown legal reason for granting the unhappy Dreyfus a new hearing. Colonel Picquart plays the man's part to the end by indignantly disclaiming his share in the current amnesty. Find somebody who has a crime or fault to answer for, he cries, before you put his name in an amnesty bill.

Unsung by Markham.

Boston Advertiser.

Bowed with the weight of centuries on his brow; oppressed with care and other heavy loads; no need to tell of conscience and its goads, while he remembers things forgot till now. His fingers clutch at swiftly slipping strings. Despair has seized him for its very own. He counts his steps with sad and sobbing moan, and time lags back, with still and leaden wings. Each passing moment more his aching back ages. Oh, thing of horror, type of utter woe! What need to sing of that "man with a hoe"? Pity the man bowed down with Christmas packages!

AWKWARD BUT TRUE.

Taxation Without Representation In Constant Use.

New York Journal of Commerce.

The ultimate decision in regard to the liability to our tariff duties of imports from Porto Rico and the Philippines will turn upon the distinction between political privileges and personal rights. Citizens of the United States, residing beyond the limits of the United States, have not the Constitutional right to be represented in Congress, and yet Congress has the power to tax them. Not only are citizens who do not reside in states deprived of a voice in Federal affairs, they are without Constitutional right to regulate their own. Here we have taxation without representation, as well as a denial of the principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. But while it is conceded that the political control of all territories of the United States, outside of the states, is vested absolutely in Congress, it is also claimed that the inhabitants of such territories possess the same personal and property rights that the people of the United States enjoy.

It has been held by the Supreme Court of the United States that "the personal and civil rights of the inhabitants of the territories are secured to them, as to other citizens, by the principles of Constitutional liberty which restrain all the agencies of government, state and National; their political rights are franchises which they hold as privileges in the legislative discretion of the Congress of the United States." But the definition of what constitutes these personal and civil rights is still far from complete. It has been decided that a port in the belligerent occupation of the United States is a foreign port in respect of our tariff laws. On the same high authority, the question is settled that under our revenue laws every port must be regarded as a foreign one unless the custom-house from which the vessel clears is within a collection district established by act of Congress and the officers granting the clearance exercise their functions under the authority and control of the laws of the United States. But the further question has arisen, does this contemplate merely a transitory condition—a period between the passing of an old regime and the complete establishment of a new one under the auspices of Congress?

It is conceded that during the term in which administrative authority is, perforce, supreme, the President may levy customs duties in the annexed territory and duties may be collected here on goods imported from the new territory. But are such acts merely abnormal and provisional, resting wholly upon the inaction of Congress; and when Congress does act is it obliged by the letter and spirit of the Constitution to impose uniform duties throughout all the territory belonging to the United States? That is the real question on which the Supreme Court has been called to pass, and to which its answer will have a momentous and far-reaching significance.

Let Banks Pay Interest on Deposits.

New York Evening Post.

In the course of a speech at the Bankers' dinner, Secretary Gage made a suggestion that it would be a good plan to require the banks to pay interest on the deposits which the Government makes with them from time to time, in order to avoid contraction of the currency by an accumulation of money in the Treasury. He thought that interest at 2 per cent would be about right. Of course this would necessitate a change of the law, but to pay interest it would be necessary in practice to relieve the banks from the necessity of depositing bonds as security. When they buy bonds bearing 2 per cent interest and turn these over to the Government, they really lend their own money at something less than 2 per cent, and they take the risk of a decline in the market price of the bonds besides. Then they get an equal or nearly equal amount of the Government's money, repayable on demand, in place of their own. Now, if they have to pay 2 per cent interest to the Government for the deposited money, there will not be sufficient profit to them to make it worth while to take the money. This is evidenced by the fact that 2 per cent is usually the highest price they are willing to pay to individuals or to each other for deposits payable on demand, for which they give no bond security whatever.

Russia and the Monroe Doctrine.

New York Journal of Commerce.

The tone of the St. Petersburg press on the Senate's attitude toward the Isthmian canal shows that the Russian Government realizes its mistake when it assumed an unfriendly attitude toward this country in its controversy with Spain. That left the door open for England to thwart a combination against us, and Anglo-Americanism became very demonstrative. At the present time the Russian press is heartily with the United States. The abandonment of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty is likened to Russia's decision after France had been defeated by Germany to be no longer bound by her agreement to maintain no war vessels on the Black Sea, and it is pointed out that while Western Europe has always hated the Monroe Doctrine, Russia has never shared that feeling. This is very rich, as the Monroe Doctrine was a response to the overtures of Canning, and the Czar Alexander I was one of the three European potentates, constituting the Holy Alliance, at whom the Monroe Doctrine was aimed.

Who Favors Free Divorce?

Buffalo Evening News.

A movement has been going on in all the states for some time past to have uniform laws of divorce. Chairman Ray of the judiciary committee of the House of Representatives has written a letter saying that to the best of his ability he will "press a proposed amendment to the Constitution giving Congress full power to enact uniform laws on the subject of marriage and divorce." Now the question comes up: "How will uniformity be brought about?" There is a growing tendency among the churches to restrict the causes for which divorces should be granted, while others desire an open door for disagreeing married couples. The tendency of Legislatures is in favor of divorces and recognizing various causes as sufficient for the breaking of marriage covenants. The fear is, therefore, that a National law would lean in the direction of "free divorce."

Costly City Government.

New statistics regarding the greatness of Greater New York have just been made public. A student of municipal machinery says it is costing every man, woman and child $23 92 a year to keep things moving. The Police Department alone costs $3 61 per citizen, while the average debt per head is $73 21. On the other hand, the per capita valuation of every resident is $1611 97, a decidedly safe margin of assets. These figures are based on the last census, and show that New York is second only in riches and municipal expenses to Boston.

New Year's Wishes.

What shall I wish thee?
Treasures of earth?
Songs in the Spring-time?
Pleasures and mirth?
Flowers on thy pathway?
Skies ever clear?
Would this insure thee
A "Happy New Year"?

What shall I wish thee?
What can be found,
Bringing thee sunshine
All the year round?
Where is the treasure,
Lasting and dear,
That shall insure thee
A "Happy New Year"?

Faith that increaseth,
Walking in light,
Hope that aboundeth,
Joyous and bright,
Love that is perfect,
Casting out fear;
These shall insure thee
A "Happy New Year"!

—Selected.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

Happy New Century.

Make your resolutions for the next 100 years.

Possibly you heard the new century arrive last night.

We have had a wet year, but it was rung out last night.

The word "ubiquity" never had a real chance till Pat Crowe left Omaha.

Few of us will live to see another end-of-the-century discussion—thank Heaven!

Take a good look at today, you will never see another like it for 100 long years.

How many times do you expect to write the wrong dates on your letters this morning?

Mr. Bryan says that office should be only an incident in a man's career. It is a closed incident in his.

Emperor William is coming to America, Captain Coghlan, it is reported, has asked for permission to serve in the Philippines.

Some of the babes who were born today will at the close of the century get their pictures in the paper, that is if they never use whisky or tobacco.

The following touching little poem has been dedicated to Lord Roberts:

He who fights and sails away,
Must come and fight some other day.

He told a story and he told it well.
I always think of him with fond regret.
Though years have passed and I am far away,
His memory is a pleasure ever yet.
In business he was never any good,
His uselessness no tongue could fitly tell;
Yet Fancy lingers fondly o'er his name—
He told a story and he told it well.

He borrowed freely but he never paid;
He never told the truth if he could lie;
He drank too much—of booze that others bought,
His poor wife sought her father's house to die.
Yet with my pipe and high ball here tonight,
While Memory in the firelight weaves her spell,
The joy he gave shall cover all his faults—
He told a story and he told it well.

Oh mother, tender mother,
The night is drawing near,
The terror-breathing darkness
Will all too soon be here.
The kidnap man is lurking
Outside the garden gate.
He'll nab thy bright-haired darling,
And with him emigrate.
So when the pallid evening
Illumes the golden West,
When tomcats seek the housetop,
And rubins seek their nest,
Take up thy precious treasure
Within thy loving arm,
And in a steel safe place him,
Away from every harm.
There safely he shall slumber,
Through all the fearful night,
Unless some bad man seeks him
With drill and dynamite.

The following passage from "Sons of the Morning" by Eden Phillpotts is an example of really fine writing that is worth remembering:

Humor she still possessed, for it is an inherent faculty that sticks closer than a spouse to the heart that holds it from puberty to the grave. It wakens with the dawn of adult intelligence, and neither time nor chance, neither shattering reverse nor unexpected prosperity can rob the owner of it. Earthly success it brightens and earthly failure it sets in true perspective; it regulates man's self-estimate and personal point of view; enlarges his sympathies, adjusts the too staring splendor of sudden joys, helps to dry the bitterest tears humanity can shed. For this humor is an adjunct divine and as far beyond the trivial word for it as "love" is, or "charity." No definition nor happy phrase sums it correctly, or rates it high enough; it is a balm of life; it makes for greater things than clean laughter from the lungs; it is the root of tolerance, the prop of patience; it "suffers long and is kind"; serves to tune each little life-harmony with the world-harmony about it; keeps the heart of man sweet and his soul modest. And at the last, when the light thickens and the mesh grows tight, humor can share the suffering vigils of the sleepless, can soften pain, can brighten the ashy road to death.

PLEASANTRIES OF PARAGRAPHERS

He—Has your father any objections to my calling on you? She (an heiress)—No. But he said you couldn't call on him.—Harper's Bazar.

A Plausible Explanation.—"I believe I know what ailed Hamlet." "What?" "He couldn't think what to get Ophelia for a Christmas gift."—Chicago Record.

He—Why so quiet, dear? I haven't heard you open your mouth hardly once today. She—Oh, I'm saving myself for the whist party tonight.—Yonkers Statesman.

Young Mother (to butcher)—I have brought my little baby, Mr. Bullwinkle. Will you kindly weigh him? Butcher—Yes, ma'am; bones an' all, I s'pose?—Tit-Bits.

An Exception.—He—Some men can't keep their eyes off the ladies. She—Unless those men happen to be sitting in a street-car, while the ladies are standing.—Philadelphia Press.

Began Like One.—Mamma—Once upon a time there was a goose that laid golden eggs—Little Eddie (interrupting)—Is we to believe this story, mamma? Mamma (amused)—Just as you please. Little Eddie (with a sigh of relief)—Oh, I thought perhaps it was a Bible story.—Brooklyn Life.

Shakespearean Criticism.—"Feller name o' Shakespeare fooled our folks purty well las' week," said Mr. Meddergrass. "He gave a show called Julius Caesar down to the opry-house, an' blamed of the whole thing wasn't made up out o' pieces that's been spoke at the school exhibitions here for twenty year."—Baltimore American.

Childish Glee.—"Do you want a Christmas tree this year, my little man?" asked Bobby's uncle. "Oh, yes, sir," came the reply in a sweet, childish treble. "Last year father burnt his whiskers all off lighting the wax candles, and Aunt Jane fell off the step-ladder, and I wouldn't have missed it for anything."—Washington Star.

"Follow Me 'Ome."

Rudyard Kipling.

There was no one like 'im, 'orse or foot,
Nor any of the guns I know;
An' because it was so, why o' course 'e went an' died;
Which is just what the best men do.

So it's knock out your pipes an' follow me!
An' it's finish up your swipes an' follow me!
O, 'ark to the big drum callin'—
Follow me—follow me 'ome!

'Is mare she neighs the 'ole day long—
She paws the 'ole night through,
An' she won't take 'er feed' cause o' waitin' for 'is step,
Which is just what a beast would do.

'Is girl she goes with a bombardier
Before 'er month is through;
An' the bans are up in church, for she's got the beggar 'ooked—
Which is just what a girl would do.

We fought 'bout a dog—last week it were—
No more than a round or two;
But I struck 'im cruel 'ard, an' I wish I 'adn't now—
Which is just what a man can't do.

'E was all I 'ad in the way of a friend,
An' I've 'ad to find one new;
But I'd give my pay an' stripe for to get the beggar back,
Which it's just too late to do.

So it's knock out your pipes an' follow me!
An' it's finish up your swipes an' follow me!
O, 'ark to the big drum callin'—
Follow me—follow me 'ome!

Take 'im away! 'E's gone where the best men go.
Take 'im away! An' the gun-wheels turnin' slow.
Take 'im away! There's more from the place 'e come.
Take 'im away with the limber an' the drum.

For it's "Three rounds blank" an' follow me;
An' it's a "Thirteen rank" an' follow me;
O, passin' the love o' women,
Follow me—follow me 'ome!